

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
CAMDEN VICINAGE

_____)	
<i>In Re: Valsartan, Losartan, and Irbesartan</i>)	19-MD-2875 (RBK-SAK)
Products Liability Litigation)	
)	Order RE: Wholesalers' Objections to
)	Special Master Order 64
<i>This document applies to all cases.</i>)	
_____)	

KUGLER, District Judge:

THIS MATTER HAVING COME BEFORE the Court, pursuant to *Fed. R. Civ. P. 53(f)*, upon Wholesaler Defendants' Motion to Object ["the Motion"] (Doc. No. 2050) to Special Master Order 64 ["SMO 64"] (Doc. No. 2015);

THE MOTION RELATING to: Wholesalers' belief that Plaintiffs will use SMO 64 to require more than supplementation to indemnification documents discovery, and to: Wholesalers' seeking clarification regarding what responses would be required to Plaintiffs' possible new requests for production of information regarding defense and indemnification issues, which may exceed the scope of Plaintiffs' prior negotiated and approved discovery requests;

THE COURT FINDING that this motion is not the proper subject of a Rule 53 objection as it seeks clarification as to the limits on supplemental discovery allowed by SMO 64, and as a matter of procedure, is therefore better placed before Special Master, Judge (Ret.) Vanaskie,

THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS:

The Motion is **DENIED**, and

REMANDED to the Special Master, so that the Parties properly place their concerns on additional, supplementary, and/or new discovery requests relating to Defendants' indemnification and defense agreements before the Special Master for resolution.

Dated: 10 May 2022

s/ Robert B. Kugler
The Honorable ROBERT B. KUGLER
United States District Court